

1964

In the end Project Apollo itself could turn out to be the greatest waste. Many authorities believe it is highly unlikely that man can reach the moon in this decade. As yet, we haven't even been able to land instruments to determine what is on the surface of the moon. Recent discoveries raise a question whether the danger of radiation from solar flares may be far greater for moon voyagers than previously believed. And there are many other stubborn problems yet to be solved.

Even assuming eventual success, enormous waste was built into Project Apollo by turning it for propaganda reasons into a crash program. The political decision to put men on the moon by 1970 was made hurriedly—"over a weekend," one NASA scientist remarked caustically—and at a time when even the ablest scientists could not foresee the magnitude of the task. The decision meant that, instead of developing space capability step by step, the project was vastly speeded up to keep Apollo on schedule at any cost.

COST-PLUS

Further waste was built into our space program because, in the past, most NASA research-and-development projects have been on cost-plus-fixed-fee contracts. The fee or profit is fixed in advance, but the contractor's cost are paid as they accrue. In some cases, of course—especially in research and development, where costs may be unknowable in advance—this system is essential. But its defect is that contractors, knowing they will be repaid anyway, sometimes grow careless about how much they spend.

Only in recent months has NASA begun to exert better control—through incentive contracts—over spending of contractors. Since some of the spiraling costs come about because NASA changes objectives as a program progresses, aims should be more accurately determined before the contracts are let.

WHO'S RESPONSIBLE?

It would be easy but unreasonable to place all the blame for waste in our space program on NASA's management. To be sure, the agency has demonstrated an uninhibited ability to spend money, but it also has been asked to perform a near miracle in getting the United States to the top fast in space capability. Haste, as usual, has made waste, and the responsibility rests primarily upon the administration and Congress.

Administrator Webb insists that, after several reorganizations during the past 2 years, the agency has been brought under efficient control and "the right people have been put in the right spots." One can hope that this is true. One can also hope that, as we move to other projects even more daring and difficult, Congress will remember Webb's statement: "Our space program has a brake as well as a throttle. We can and will operate on whatever money Congress comes up with."

Right there, of course, lies the crux of the problem. It is not easy to apply the brake. The States and communities that now benefit hugely from NASA spending also exert powerful pressure to keep the golden stream of dollars flowing, while the States that have been left out clamor for their share. This leads to political deals—and to a skyborne pork barrel, which already has become a powerful factor in economic life here on earth.

[From the New York Times, Aug. 2, 1964]
TRIUMPH FOR "RANGER 7"

Publication of the first sample of lunar pictures taken by *Ranger 7* confirms with extraordinary force that this rocket's flight has been one of the most successful and productive experiments in scientific history. The exquisite clarity of the close-ups of the moon's surface transmitted to earth assure

that this event will be recorded as the real beginning of serious human exploration of the moon from the neighborhood of that satellite.

The full exploitation and analysis of new information will take several years, but even the first preliminary study has cleared up major problems and dispelled previous ignorance on important matters. The principal conclusion, of course, is that much of the lunar surface is smooth enough to be suitable for safe landing on it of manned vehicles. Areas of extreme roughness, with numerous medium-sized and small craters previously unknown, have also been found, alerting Project Apollo planners to the importance of avoiding such regions. The fears reputable scientists had expressed earlier about the possibility that the moon was covered with a thick layer of dust, in which vehicles or men landing there might be buried, have been shown to be baseless.

The conception behind *Ranger 7*'s flight has proved sound, and there is every reason for confidence that more such flights will greatly extend man's knowledge of lunar geography and topography. They should also help answer many questions about the forces that have shaped this satellite and its weird surface. Clearly, enormous amounts of information about the moon can be gathered by unmanned rockets, like *Ranger 7*, carrying cameras and other instruments.

As President Johnson indicated yesterday, the day is not distant when it will be possible to land men on the moon. But it is now plainer than ever that there is no great scientific necessity for racing to achieve this goal and thus vastly increasing the price in money and human peril. The potentiality for obtaining so much more information relatively cheaply from unmanned, instrument-carrying rockets strengthens the case for abandoning the arbitrary 1970 deadline for Project Apollo and substituting a schedule permitting orderly progress toward a manned voyage to the moon without hazards or costs dictated only by the desire to achieve this objective under maximum draft.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Do the Senators yield back the remainder of their time?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I yield back my time.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXMIRE].

Mr. PROXMIRE. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CLARK (when his name was called). On this vote I have a pair with the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON]. If he were present and voting he would vote "nay." If I were permitted to vote, I would vote "yea." I withhold my vote.

The rollcall was concluded.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I announce that the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BREWSTER], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. TALMADGE], and the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. WALTERS] are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] and the

Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] are absent because of illness.

I further announce that the Senator from Nevada [Mr. CANNON] and the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. EDMONDSON] are necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BREWSTER], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. CANNON], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. EDMONDSON], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], and the Senator from Georgia [Mr. TALMADGE] would each vote "nay."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER] is necessarily absent.

The result was announced—yeas 20, nays 69, as follows:

[No. 518 Leg.]

YEAS—20

Burdick	Gruening	Proxmire
Byrd, Va.	Lausche	Robertson
Church	Miller	Scott
Cooper	Morse	Simpson
Cotton	Nelson	Williams, Del.
Douglas	Pell	Young, Ohio
Fulbright	Prouty	

NAYS—69

Alken	Hill	Monroney
Allott	Holland	Morton
Bartlett	Hruska	Moss
Bayh	Humphrey	Mundt
Beall	Inouye	Muskie
Bennett	Jackson	Neuberger
Bible	Javits	Pastore
Boggs	Johnston	Pearson
Byrd, W. Va.	Jordan, N.C.	Randolph
Carlson	Jordan, Idaho	Ribicoff
Case	Keating	Russell
Curtis	Kuchel	Salinger
Dirksen	Long, Mo.	Saltonstall
Dodd	Long, La.	Smathers
Dominick	Magnuson	Smith
Eastland	Mansfield	Sparkman
Ellender	McCarthy	Stennis
Ervin	McClellan	Symington
Fong	McGee	Thurmond
Gore	McIntyre	Tower
Hart	McNamara	Williams, N.J.
Hartke	Mechem	Yarborough
Hickenlooper	Metcalf	Young, N. Dak.

NOT VOTING—11

Anderson	Edmondson	McGovern
Brewster	Goldwater	Talmadge
Cannon	Hayden	Walters
Clark	Kennedy	

So Mr. PROXMIRE's amendment was rejected.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Washington yield, so that I may interrogate the distinguished majority leader?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I should like to ask the distinguished majority leader what remains for the rest of the day; and I should like to ask the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin whether he contemplates asking for a record vote on his other amendment.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I expect to have no further record votes on my amendment.

Mr. MANSFIELD. It would be the anticipation of the leadership at the conclusion of the consideration of the pending bill the Senate would stand adjourned until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow. Based upon the statement of the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin, we may be able to consider the passage of the pending bill by a voice vote.

August 5

The purpose of having the Senate convene at 12 o'clock noon tomorrow would be to give certain committees a chance to meet and to catch up with proposed legislation that is pending before them.

I would hope—and I invite the attention of the Senator from Wisconsin, if I may have it—that the Senate would be able to proceed to the consideration of the public works appropriation bill on Friday of this week.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I should like to move tomorrow that the Senate concur in the amendments of the House to the SEC bill. The House exempted some insurance companies. It is more important to pass the bill than to insist on our bill.

Also, I hope the majority leader will permit the senior Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] to call up a little bill that will enable a Baptist church, located at a historic place where one of the relatives of George Washington lived, to buy 3 acres of land at full market value, in order that some of the military personnel and others may attend services there.

Mr. MANSFIELD. The SEC conference report will be called up tomorrow, if that answer will satisfy the distinguished Senator from Illinois, the minority leader.

I should like to ask the distinguished Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] to yield a few minutes to the distinguished senior Senator from Virginia for the purpose already expounded by the distinguished junior Senator from Virginia.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I should like to ask the majority leader about the resolution with respect to the unpleasantness in southeast Asia. It is likely to be reported by the committees tomorrow.

Mr. MANSFIELD. If it is reported, it will be taken up tomorrow.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION TOMORROW

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Foreign Relations and the Committee on Armed Services be permitted to meet during the session of the Senate tomorrow.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BAYH in the chair). Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

SALE OF PROPERTY TO WOODLAND BAPTIST CHURCH, FAIRFAX COUNTY, VA.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I yield to the distinguished senior Senator from Virginia such time as he may need.

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the pending business be temporarily laid aside and that the Senate proceed to the consideration of H.R. 11064.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title.

The bill (H.R. 11064) to provide for the conveyance of certain real property of the United States, situated in the State of Virginia, was read twice by its title.

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, the bill provides for the sale of property to the Woodland Baptist Church, Fairfax County, Va., at full value as determined by the Secretary of the Army.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the bill (H.R. 11064) was considered, ordered to a third reading, and passed.

INDEPENDENT OFFICES APPROPRIATIONS, 1965

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 11296) making appropriations for sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, corporations, agencies, and offices for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, and for other purposes.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I call up my amendment No. 1169. I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the amendment be dispensed with and that the amendment be printed in the Record.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment is as follows:

On page 2, line 22, strike out "\$4,855,000" and insert "\$4,285,000".

On page 2, line 23, strike out "\$600,000" and insert "\$250,000".

On page 4, line 2, strike out "\$650,000" and insert "\$880,000".

On page 4, line 19, strike out "\$85,000,000" and insert "\$70,000,000".

On page 5, line 7, strike out "\$69,200,000" and insert "\$19,200,000".

On page 6, lines 11-12, strike out "\$9,250,000" and insert "\$3,500,000".

On page 6, line 23, strike out "\$10,775,000" and insert "\$10,440,000".

On page 7, line 9, strike out "\$86,124,000" and insert "\$79,000,000".

On page 8, line 1, strike out "\$22,187,000" and insert "\$21,805,000".

On page 11, line 5, strike out "\$277,000" and insert "\$270,000".

On page 12, line 3, strike out "sixteen" and insert "twelve".

On page 12, line 4, strike out "twelve" and insert "eight".

On page 12, line 5, strike out "\$544,100,000" and insert "\$537,600,000".

On page 12, line 9, strike out "\$6,344,000" and insert "\$6,000,000".

On page 12, line 10, strike out "406" and insert "396".

On page 12, line 25, strike out "\$66,000,000" and insert "\$50,000,000".

On page 14, line 9, strike out "\$42,000,000" and insert "\$21,000,000".

On page 14, line 18, strike out "\$3,600,000" and insert "\$3,530,000".

On page 15, line 4, strike out "\$1,800,000" and insert "\$1,620,000".

On page 16, line 19, strike out "\$16,460,000" and insert "\$16,310,000".

On page 17, lines 1-2, strike out "\$12,699,000" and insert "\$12,180,000".

On page 17, line 10, strike out "\$13,025,000" and insert "\$12,725,000".

On page 18, line 4, strike out "\$224,570,000" and insert "\$213,800,000".

On page 19, line 23, strike out "\$161,247,500" and insert "\$151,722,000".

On page 35, line 7, strike out "\$52,420,000" and insert "\$48,920,000".

On page 35, line 22, strike out "\$15,155,000" and insert "\$14,955,000".

On page 36, line 11, strike out "\$5,765,000" and insert "\$5,465,000".

On page 37, line 4, strike out "\$3,000,000" and insert "\$2,875,000".

On page 38, line 14, strike out "\$1,530,000" and insert "\$1,505,000".

On page 39, line 14, strike out "\$21,840,000" and insert "\$19,565,000".

On page 43, line 9, strike out "\$15,925,000" and insert "\$15,525,000".

On page 43, line 12, strike out "\$3,500,000" and insert "\$3,250,000".

On page 44, line 21, strike out "\$50,000".

On page 45, line 23, strike out "\$16,084,000" and insert "\$15,484,000".

On page 46, line 7, strike out "thirty-eight" and insert "thirty-six".

On page 46, line 8, strike out "\$25,710,000" and insert "\$25,260,000".

On page 47, line 4, strike out "\$4,413,494,000" and insert "\$4,313,594,000".

On page 51, line 20, strike out "\$155,250,000" and insert "\$155,000,000".

On page 52, line 8, strike out "\$14,500,000" and insert "\$14,200,000".

On page 52, line 13, strike out "\$38,000,000 of which \$1,275,000" and insert "\$36,000,000 of which \$1,170,000".

On page 54, line 12, strike out "\$39,600,000" and insert "\$34,600,000".

On page 55, line 1, strike out "\$98,733,000" and insert "\$91,233,000".

On page 65, line 22, strike out "\$10,375,000" and insert "\$9,000,000".

On page 66, line 6, strike out "\$78,750,000" and insert "\$75,000,000".

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may yield 1 minute to the distinguished Senator from Connecticut, without losing my right to the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SUPPORT BY SENATOR DODD OF PRESIDENT JOHNSON'S ACTION ON VIETNAM

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, the immediate retaliatory action ordered by President Johnson against the North Vietnamese gunboats which had attacked our destroyers on the high seas and against their supporting facilities in North Vietnam will, I am certain, be approved by the overwhelming majority of the American people and by their Representatives in Congress.

President Johnson has made it clear that our response was limited, that we have no intention of spreading the conflict, but that our Government is prepared to take whatever measures may be necessary in order to defend the freedom of the seas and the freedom of southeast Asia.

I believe that President Johnson's prompt and decisive action is a blow for freedom and a blow for peace.

The Asian Communists for many years now have been assiduously spreading the story that the United States is a "paper tiger." They have been telling people in southeast Asia that all of the administration's actions on South Vietnam and all of its statements reconfirming our commitment to the freedom of the area, are just so much bluff because the administration's hands would be tied by the forthcoming election campaign.

Perhaps they really believed their own propaganda. Perhaps they believed that there would be no retaliation if they staged this attack on American vessels on the high seas, 65 miles distant from their own coastline. Perhaps they

1964

planned to further humiliate us in this way, and thus prove to their own people and to the other peoples of Asia that the United States is indeed no more than a "paper tiger." This, as I see it, is the only plausible explanation for what would otherwise appear to be an insane act of recklessness.

President Johnson's decisive action and the immediate support it has received from leaders of both political parties should suffice to persuade the North Vietnamese Communist leaders and their masters in Peiping that the differences which separate Republicans and Democrats and the current domestic emphasis on campaign politics do not in any way affect the essential unity of our Nation, nor do they reduce the ability of the administration to respond to open Communist aggression.

The President's action has, in short, given the lie to the Communist propaganda that our statements about South Vietnam are bluff and that the United States in a preelection period is incapable of acting decisively.

History teaches us that the failure to respond to one act of aggression inevitably begets further acts of aggression; that weakness and appeasement make the peace of the world less secure, not more secure, because they encourage the aggressors to believe that they can get away with it. It is this lesson that President Johnson was referring to when he said:

Firmness in the right is indispensable today for peace. That firmness will always be measured. Its mission is peace.

I hope that Congress will move immediately to record its support for the action taken by President Johnson.

INDEPENDENT OFFICES APPROPRIATIONS, 1965

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 11296) making appropriations for sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, corporations, agencies and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, and for other purposes.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, this amendment reduces the total appropriations recommended by the Senate Appropriations Committee for Independent offices by \$293,899,050. Amendment No. 1169 accomplishes this by reducing Senate Appropriation Committee recommendations to the House level. The House appropriated \$8,091,698,000 for independent offices, and in addition the House Appropriations Committee recommended an expenditure of \$5,200 million for our space program, which was knocked out by a point of order on the House floor because NASA funds had not yet been authorized. Thus, in the normal course of events, the House figure would probably have been \$13,291,698,000. This represents a House increase over fiscal 1964 of \$49,097,450.

The Senate Appropriations Committee increase over the House figure represents a whopping \$342,997,500 increase over fiscal 1964. Thus, the Senate increase over last year is almost seven times as great as the House increase.

Mr. President, in January of this year, President Lyndon Johnson pledged a "reduction in Federal expenditures and Federal employment." He then went on to say "by curtailing less urgent programs. I am able to recommend in this reduced budget the most Federal support in history for education, for health, for retraining the unemployed, and for helping the economically and the physically handicapped." But does the independent offices increase recommended by the Senate Appropriations Committee mean an increase in those areas of social concern the President referred to in his budget message? Does it mean an increase in education, health, retraining of the unemployed, for helping the economically and physically handicapped? The answer must be a resounding "No."

The bulk of this budget increase simply means more money for two very, very fat cats—the Federal Aviation Agency and the National Aeronautics and Space Administration. The Federal Aviation Agency, of which I shall have more to say when I discuss my amendment No. 1171, would get \$80,657,500 more than they got last year. My amendment would knock out \$43,750,000 of this amount by reducing the increase to that approved by the House. NASA would get a fantastic \$200 million more than they received last year, should the Appropriations Committee figure be approved. Here again, my amendment would cut this figure down to the amount that would in all probability have been approved by the House had not a point of order been raised. This represents a decrease of \$100 million.

The third substantial cut made by my amendment is in the civil defense agency's budget. The House cut more than \$22 million from last year's appropriations. The Senate Appropriations Committee recommends an increase over last year of \$42,631,000. This is \$65 million over the House-approved figure. Again, my amendment would eliminate the \$65 million increase. The bulk of this figure would go for shelter survey and marking. The House report felt that the great amount requested should not be approved because "the entire fallout shelter program is under study and review."

Consequently, the three biggest cutbacks my amendment makes—in NASA FAA, and civil defense—amount to \$208,750,000, more than two-thirds of the total amount my amendment would save. Surely, these funds should be cut, if we use President Johnson's criterion of social utility in evaluating budget requests.

Finally, I would stress again, as I have so often before, that to increase Federal expenditures in a year of reduced taxes, and thus to accentuate our budget deficit, is irresponsible. We are not keeping faith with the American taxpayer. This is especially so, when no social ills are attacked by the increases.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a table explaining the amendment in greater detail be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

AMENDMENTS TO INDEPENDENT OFFICES APPROPRIATIONS BILL

AMENDMENT TO KNOCK TOTAL DOWN TO HOUSE FIGURE

The House appropriated \$8,091,698,000. In addition to this, the House Appropriations Committee recommended \$5,200 million for NASA which was knocked out on a point of order because these funds had not yet been authorized. Thus, in the normal course of events, the House figure would probably have been \$13,291,698,000:

House figure.....	\$8,091,698,000
House recommendation for NASA.....	5,200,000,000

House total.....	13,291,698,000
------------------	----------------

The Senate committee recommended \$13,585,597,050, an increase of \$293,899,050 over the House total:

Senate recommendation....	\$13,585,597,050
House total.....	13,291,698,000

Senate increase.....	293,899,050
----------------------	-------------

This amendment would reduce the total appropriation by \$293,899,050 from \$13,585,597,050 to \$13,291,698,050.

The budget request was for \$14,221,511,400. The House version cuts \$929,813,400 off this while the Senate cuts only \$635,914,350:

Budget request.....	\$14,221,511,400
House version.....	13,291,698,000

House cuts.....	929,813,400
-----------------	-------------

Budget request.....	14,221,511,400
Senate version.....	13,585,597,050

Senate cuts.....	635,914,350
------------------	-------------

The fiscal year 1964 appropriations totaled \$13,242,600,550. Thus the House would increase this for fiscal year 1965 by \$49,097,450, while the Senate would make a whopping \$342,997,500 increase over fiscal year 1964:

House version.....	\$13,291,698,000
Fiscal year 1964 appropriations.....	13,242,600,550

House increase over fiscal year 1964....	49,097,450
--	------------

Senate version.....	13,585,597,050
Fiscal year 1964 appropriations.....	13,242,600,550

Senate increase over fiscal year 1964....	342,997,500
---	-------------

Thus the Senate increase over last year is almost seven times as great as the House increase.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I reserve the remainder of my time.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, will the Senator from Washington yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield 1 minute to the Senator from New Jersey.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Jersey is recognized for 1 minute.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, I oppose the amendment offered by the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin. The amendment would reduce from \$42 million to \$21 million the appropriations for Federal Aviation Agency research and development.

Mr. President, I hope that the Senate will accept the recommendation of our Appropriations Committee and approve the full amount requested by the administration for Federal Aviation Agency research and development. I was surprised to learn that the \$42 million requested for

FAA research will be—if it is approved—almost all that is being spent in the entire country on the effort to improve air safety.

The main challenge facing aeronautical science today is making air travel safer. During 1963, 896 persons were killed in nonmilitary airplane accidents in this country. The worldwide fatality rate, approximately 11 deaths per billion passenger miles flown, has not been reduced at all during the last 10 years.

Yet, commercial aviation is a rapidly expanding industry throughout the world. If air traffic continues to increase and there is no reason to believe it will not, we shall be averaging one major air disaster every day by the end of the 1980's, unless the fatality rate can be reduced. This could mean as many as 15,000 persons killed every year.

I see no reason why we have to accept a situation like this when, by continuing and expanding research projects already undertaken by air safety experts, we have a good chance to make significant advances in the reduction of flight hazards.

The National Aviation Facilities Experimental Center, near Atlantic City, N.J.—NAFEC—is one of this Nation's No. 1 research resources. Yet, if the House-approved appropriation for FAA research were approved, 25 to 30 percent of the Center's 1,300-man work force might be laid off, and half or more of the research projects now underway would have to be dropped.

Mr. President, I submit that this is the most false and dangerous kind of economy, and I strongly urge approval of the Senate Appropriations Committee recommendation of \$42 million for FAA research and development.

I ask unanimous consent that a brief description of NAFEC projects, prepared at my request by Mr. Joseph Blatt, Research Director for the Federal Aviation Agency, be printed in the *Record*. This statement will show, in somewhat more technical terms, what the House action would mean to air safety research, and all who travel by air, if it were allowed to stand.

There being no objection, the description was ordered to be printed in the *Record*, as follows:

The House action, cutting the budget request made by the President for the Federal Aviation Agency's Research and Development appropriation by 50 percent will seriously disrupt the Agency's efforts to make significant improvements in the National Airspace System in the next few years. Specifically:

1. The proposed budget contemplated \$18.1 million for the development, test, and evaluation of components, systems, and procedures for the control of enroute and terminal air traffic. The primary effort under the budget plan was to develop the equipment and procedures for the first phase of a semi-automated system during fiscal year 1965. Current fiscal year funds have been utilized to order the development of a significant portion of the engineering model equipment to be delivered to the National Aviation Facilities Experimental Center. The proposed reduction will force the Agency to defer the purchasing of the additional equipment required for the completion of the model. This will result in reduced effort at NAFEC

and the delay of improvements in the field environment until adequate funds are provided in a future year to complete the developmental effort.

2. One of the most important research and development efforts of the Agency has been the progressive development of components to lower the permissive meteorological minima for approach and landing and ultimately develop an all-weather landing capability. The major emphasis in fiscal year 1965 was the development and implementation at NAFEC of an integrated all-weather final approach flareout and landing system with all-weather takeoff minima. Under the proposed reduction we will have to limit our efforts to the so-called category II (100-foot ceiling and one-quarter mile visibility) effort; thus denying aviation the degree of reliability; and safety under all-weather conditions that the state-of-the-art could provide.

3. The radical reduction in funds will force the Agency to reappraise its decision with respect to future programs at NAFEC. As a minimum a significant reduction must be made in the personnel working on research and development projects at Atlantic City. It is estimated that this reduction in personnel will be extremely destructive of the capability that has been developed at Atlantic City over the past 5 years. It will constitute a threat to our personnel and a serious deterrent to the reduction of the most competent personnel now on hand at NAFEC who form the nucleus of a most valuable national asset.

4. At NAFEC a portion of our effort is devoted toward applied research which involves looking at advances in the state-of-the-art and investigations looking toward the resolution of problems in the national airspace. The proposed reduction will force the Agency to eliminate this type of activity and to disband the organization we have created to work in this area.

5. The reduction will cause the Agency to completely eliminate such investigations as the utilization of very low-frequency techniques for the resolution of long-distance transoceanic and transcontinental navigation problems and airborne collision prevention systems.

6. Work in improvement in aircraft lighting and design, improved communications, improved weather data presentation equipment, improvements to our radar acquisition system, and the development of improvements in flight inspection equipment will be seriously curtailed at NAFEC.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, I urge a resounding "no" vote for the amendment of the Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Washington yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield 3 minutes to the Senator from New York.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York is recognized for 3 minutes.

FLIGHT SERVICE STATIONS

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, on January 31, 1964, the Federal Aviation Agency announced that it intended to consolidate 42 flight service stations throughout this country in the interest of economy. Three of the flight service stations to be closed are located in Elmira, Poughkeepsie, and Utica, N.Y. The FAA's proposed action, consequently, has been a matter of vital importance and concern both to the communities affected and to New York State as a whole.

The problem of the consolidation of the flight service stations has been the subject of careful study by the Subcommittee on Transportation and Aeronautics of the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, which held hearings on this subject on May 12, 1964. The report of the subcommittee is expected to be filed in the near future. The subject was also considered on the floor of the House on May 21, 1964, during debate on the independent offices appropriations bill. At that time, the House adopted an amendment to continue operations of certain flight service stations until the end of the fiscal year. Regrettably, the Senate Appropriations Committee did not include this amendment in the bill which it reported July 30, 1964. However, there are assurances which the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Agency gave in his letter to me of January 31, 1964, that the program of consolidation would be carried out during the next 12 to 24 months; therefore, not until, at the earliest, next February.

The Administrator testified before the Independent Offices Appropriations Subcommittee, at page 1475 of the record of hearings that the FAA had abandoned the scheme to close down the flight service stations, although it might reduce 24-hour service of the stations to somewhere between 8- and 16-hour service. Moreover, in a letter from the Federal Aviation Agency to Representative ROBERT DOLE, dated March 24, 1964, printed in the record of debate by the House on this appropriation bill, Assistant FAA Administrator William J. Schulte stated that:

I want to reconfirm the fact that the consolidation is not planned to take place for 12 to 24 months.

It is also clear from the record of the House debate that the chairman of the Appropriations Subcommittee understood that no consolidation would take place for at least 12 months. Based on this record, it seems quite clear that the FAA will not close any of the flight service stations until very careful consideration has been given to all alternatives consistent with full flight safety at the individual airports.

The FAA has estimated that the consolidation of the 42 flight service stations would bring about substantial savings. They have estimated that the savings in consolidating the Elmira, Poughkeepsie, and Utica, N.Y., flight service stations would amount to \$171,000. I should like to make clear that I have always supported and will continue to support efforts by Federal agencies to achieve meaningful savings of Federal funds. The prudent and economical use of our Government's funds is an objective worthy of our best efforts. I do believe, however, that the Federal agency which proposes economy measures must bear the burden of proof that true and meaningful savings will be accomplished without loss of necessary and vital services to our citizens.

The Senator from New York [Mr. KEATING] and I have asked the Comptroller General of the United States to prepare an analysis of the savings to be